

NPIC/TDS/D-902-67  
22 June 1967

Approved 22 June 1967  
by [redacted] 25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Development Staff, TD

SUBJECT : Subcontractor for Optics Portion of the High Precision  
Stereo Comparator

25X1 1. As you are aware, [redacted] has sent forward a first choice recommendation  
25X1 of [redacted] was not happy with the prospect of a foreign  
contractor.

2. I agreed to review the proposals of the top three bidders and make a  
recommendation based upon that evaluation.

25X1 3. The review of the "proposals" does little if anything to clarify the  
situation since they are not proposals in the sense we use the word. Only  
[redacted] offered a good technical proposal. [redacted] visited 25X1  
the top bidders and their evaluation is based more on this than on the "pro-  
posal." Therefore, their Visit Summary, written by [redacted] is somewhat 25X1  
enlightening.

25X1 4. [redacted] sent their RFQ to 104 concerns 61 foreign and 43 domestic. Only  
8 firms bid. Of these 8, only 6 showed any reasonable promise. These were in  
order of NIR's evaluation.

Evaluation:

25X1 A. [redacted]  
B.  
C.  
D.  
E.  
F.

25X1 5. Of these 6, only three would appear to be able to handle the job and  
to manufacture the equipment, i.e., provide anything but the design work. This  
narrows the group down to the first three. A close review of the [redacted] 25X1  
[redacted] "proposals" and summary reports indicates that their proposal was written  
by [redacted] who is their Optical Consultant (an excellent one, by the way). With  
the exception of [redacted] who would be a real asset, [redacted] has little 25X1  
to offer--this leaves only [redacted] 25X1

Declass Review by NIMA/DOD

6. A close evaluation of the available information would indicate the following facts:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ILLEGIB

A. Advantages

(1) A large company the size of [REDACTED] with equal or superior capabilities.

25X1

(2) Highly recommended by [REDACTED]

25X1

(3) Considerable design and production experience in Zoom Optics. [REDACTED] says their Zoom designs are among the best in the world.

(4) Considerable design and production experience in first order stereo plotters. They understand photogrammetry, reticals, etc.

(5) [REDACTED] fixed price and probably would be cheaper for fabrication than Diffraction Limited.

(6) First choice of our contractor. He rated them extremely high. See attached sheet.

(7) Early delivery -- this is critical to [REDACTED] and to us (because of costs).

25X1

B. Disadvantages

(1) Foreign firm, communications problems and metric/English measurement problems. (By the way, [REDACTED] do

25X1

(2) Poorer contractual position.

(3) Poor proposal but within what [REDACTED] asked for (see their RFQ). We would have to see a good work statement prior to contract.

25X1

(4) Difficult to monitor (foreign travel, etc.).

25X1

[REDACTED]

A. Advantages

- (1) Competent American firm with [ ] well known to us -- he has system clearances and will understand our problem.
- (2) No monitoring or communications problems; also, we have some leverage if we need it.
- (3) Capable small firm that could build the system once designed.

B. Disadvantages

- (1) Higher cost [ ] CPFF-not fixed price-(will consider CPAF).
- (2) [ ] had trouble getting along with them on their first visit-- see Visit Summary.
- (3) Little or no experience in zoom system (to best of my knowledge).
- (4) Probably higher cost to fabricate than [ ]
- (5) Second choice of [ ] - remember the "I told you so" problem that can result.
- (6) Poor proposal-lacks facts.
- (7) Long delivery time.

7. After reviewing the reports and proposals I had Bill call [ ] to get answers on some technical questions. Their answers were all satisfactory. They agreed they do not have an acceptable "proposal" in the contractual sense; this is one reason they need to go back and talk with [ ] They have also gone back to [ ] to see if they could get a better proposal, better delivery schedule and better rapport.

8. After much soul searching, I would make the following recommendation, that we give [ ] permission to revisit [ ] (2 people maximum) and see if they can come back with an acceptable work statement--not a contract. At the same time, they should recontact [ ] (as they have done) and not close that door. If they still think [ ] is the best subcontractor, I think we should permit them to go ahead to a contract. I can't come up with strong enough reasons not to.

[ ]  
Chief, ESE/DS